

App. Ser. No. 10/674,943
Reply to Office action of May 18, 2006
Reply Date: August 16, 2006

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the May 18, 2006 office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-20 under USC 35
5 103(a) as being anticipated by United States Patent 6,763,398 (Brant) in view of US Patent No
5,469,453 (Glider). Applicants have amended Claims 1-12 and 14-20 and cancelled Claim 13.
Claims 1-12 and 14-20 are now pending of which Claims 1, 7 and 14 are independent claims.
Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims based on the amendments and
the remarks below.

10

Amendment to Specification

The minor changes to the specification have been made to fix typographical errors and no
new matter has been added.

Objection to Abstract

The Examiner had objected to the Abstract not being on a single page. Applicants
15 provide the Abstract on a single page and respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to Claim 13 and 14. Applicants have amended Claims 13-14 to
clarify the invention and respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 103(b)

20

Claims 7, 13 and 15

Regarding Claims 7, 13 and 14, the Examiner states:

25

"As to claims 7, 13 and 14, Brant discloses a system for performing data integrity process,
the system includes an adapter in a RAID controller (310) that is coupled to a host (320)
on one side and a storage media (210) on another side. The system comprises a CRC
logic that can perform data integrity process (col. 4, lines 65 through col. 5 line 19; col. 6,
lines 10-21). Brant differs from claim 14 that he does not explicitly disclose using one
of plural CRC modes including append, validate and keep, and validate and remove

App. Ser. No. 10/674,943
Reply to Office action of May 18, 2006
Reply Date: August 16, 2006

mode. However this limitation is well known in the art, as evidenced by Glider (col. 9, lines 36-44). (Office Action, Page 2, Section 3)

Brant and Glider in combination or by themselves fail to disclose the elements of the present invention, as outlines in amended Claim 7. In particular the references fail to disclose a system for managing data integrity in receive and transmit path of an adapter, where "a processor executing firmware code for selecting one of plural modes for implementing cyclic redundancy code ("CRC") including append mode, validate and keep mode, and validate and remove mode, wherein during append mode, a CRC engine determines CRC for each data block and CRC seed value is incremented for each data block such that each data block has a unique CRC value." (Amended Claim 7).

Applicants agree with the Examiner that Brant does not disclose using one of plural CRC modes. Applicants respectfully disagree that Glider discloses that limitation.

The Examiner has relied on Glider, Col.9, lines 36-44 to reject the limitation "selecting one of plural modes for implementing cyclic redundancy code ("CRC") including append mode, validate and keep mode, and validate and remove mode".

In Col 9, lines 36-44, Glider discloses "CRC Code 504". Glider states "inclusion of this field 504 allows the disk storage system to detect random data errors occurring on the bus between the device controller and the RAID controller". This simply states that a disk storage system can detect errors but it does not suggest or disclose that there are different modes in an adapter for implementing CRC and that those modes can be selected by using firmware code, as stated in amended Claim 7. Hence, this is different from the limitation in Claim 7 (and in Claim 14).

App. Ser. No. 10/674,943
Reply to Office action of May 18, 2006
Reply Date: August 16, 2006

Claim 14 is also patentably different over Brant and Glider, for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 7. Therefore, Claims 7 and 14 are patentably distinguishable over Brant and Glider and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 7 and 10.

Claims 8-12/15-20:

5 Claims 8-12 and 15-20 depend from Claim 7 and 14, respectively, are thus patentably distinguished over Brant and Glider for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to Claims 7 and 14. Therefore, Applicant respectfully request allowance of Claims 8-12/15-20.

Claims 1-7:


10 Claims 1-7 are patentably distinguished over Brant and Glider for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to Claims 7 and 14. Therefore, Applicant respectfully request allowance of Claims 1-7.

CONCLUSION

15 For the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe Claims 1-12 and 14-20 are allowable, and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned Attorney at (949)-955-1920.

Dated: August 16, 2006

Respectfully submitted,


Tejinder Singh
Reg. No. 39,535
Attorney for Applicants
Tel.: (949) 955-1920